

REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 17, 29, 30, 42, 50, 51, 54, and 58-60. Claims 1-64 are currently pending. Of these, claims 1, 17, 29, 30, 42, 54, and 62 are independent.

In the Office Action dated March 22, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-18, 21-22, 24-31, 34-35, 37-43, 46-47, 49-55, and 59-63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,370,549 to Saxton ("Saxton") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0052954 to Polizzi et al. ("Polizzi").¹ Claims 3-4, 19-20, 32-33, 44-45, 56-57, and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxton and Polizzi and further in view of XBRL Specification by Hamscher et al. ("Hamscher"). Claims 8-10, 23, 36, 48, and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxton and Polizzi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,563 to Clancey et al. ("Clancey").

A. Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for pointing out deficiencies in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 16, 2003. Applicants are concurrently filing, with this amendment, an Information Disclosure Statement including legible copies of the cited documents.

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

B. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-18, 21-22, 24-31, 34-35, 37-43, 46-47, 49-55, and 59-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxton in view of Polizzi. No *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to these claims for at least the reason that the references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claims.

For example, amended claim 1 recites, among other things: “an editor that develops a report by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text documents to form a structure of the report.” Saxton and Polizzi taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this element of claim 1, or similar recitations in claims 17, 29, 30, 42, and 54.

In the Office Action, the Examiner observed that Saxton fails to disclose an editor that develops reports by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text documents and retrieves data from one or more sources to represent one or more values within the report. (See Office Action, § 5, at 3.) In an attempt to remedy this deficiency, the Examiner proposed combining a job server disclosed by Polizzi with the disclosure of Saxton. (See Office Action, § 5, at 3 (citing Polizzi, Abstract).)

Polizzi discloses a job server that performs tasks, such as “preparing a report based upon retrieved data.” (Polizzi, Abstract.) Polizzi further discloses that reports are stored in a repository with other computer files arranged in categories so that “users can find information in an intuitive manner” and to “efficiently [implement] security measures

for sensitive data." (See Polizzi, page 3, paragraph [0024]; Polizzi, page 6, paragraph [0038].) However, the computer files of Polizzi are not referenced "to form a structure of [a] report," as claimed. Instead, reports are prepared based upon retrieved data and, like other computer files, are merely stored under a category in the repository of Polizzi. (See Polizzi, page 3, paragraph [0024].)

Therefore Polizzi fails to teach or suggest "an editor that develops a report by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text documents to form a structure of the report," as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 17, 29, 30, 42, and 54. Saxton fails to even disclose the editor, as properly observed by the Office Action. Accordingly, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to claims 1, 17, 29, 30, 42, and 54.

Claims 2, 4-16, 18, 20-28, 31, 33-41, 43, 45-53, 55, and 57-61 depend from and add additional features to each of independent claims 1, 17, 30, 42, and 54. Accordingly, these claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As to claim 62, Saxton and Polizzi taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every claim element of claim 62. For example, claim 62 recites, among other things, "a parser that . . . interprets tags included in the one or more text documents to create software elements, and determines the hierarchy of the software elements within a structure representative of the one or more text documents."

The M.P.E.P. requires that all actions on the merits issued by an Examiner “be complete and clear as to all matters.” 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(b). See also M.P.E.P. § 707.07. Specifically, 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2) provides that

“[i]n rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best reference at his or her command. *When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference ... must be clearly explained...*” (italics added).

See also M.P.E.P. §707.

According to the Examiner, Saxton allegedly discloses “a parser that . . . creates software elements having a format with a hierachal relationship between the software elements based on the one or more text documents,” which Applicants do not concede. (See Office Action, § 5, at 3 (citing Saxton, Abstract and col. 5, line 64 - col. 6, line 16).) Even if such were the case, the Examiner has not provided citations to any portions of Saxton or Polizzi that correspond to “a parser that . . . interprets tags included in the one or more text documents to create software elements, and determines the hierarchy of the software elements within a structure representative of the one or more text documents,” as claimed.

Because Saxton and Polizzi fail to teach or suggest every claim element of claim 62, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 62 and claim 63, which depends from claim 62, should be withdrawn. Furthermore, should the Examiner continue to rely on

Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 07643.0042

Saxton and Polizzi in rejecting claim 62 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner must provide specific citations to the portions of Saxton and Polizzi relied upon to support such a rejection.

Claims 3-4, 19-20, 32-33, 44-45, 56-57, and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxton and Polizzi and further in view of Hamscher. No *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to these claims for at least the reason that the references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claims.

Hamscher is directed to a XBRL Specification for defining XBRL elements and attributes that can be used in the creation, exchange, and comparison tasks of financial reporting (See Hamscher, Abstract), but fails to teach or suggest “an editor that develops a report by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text documents to form a structure of the report,” as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 17, 29, 30, 42, and 54. Therefore, Hamscher fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Saxton and Polizzi and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3-4, 19-20, 32-33, 44-45, 56-57, and 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 8-10, 23, 36, 48, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxton and Polizzi and further in view of Clancey. No *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to these claims for at least

Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 07643.0042

the reason that the references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claims.

Clancey is directed to a method of creating and editing reports using a predefined report that can be customized (See Clancey, col. 24, lines 5-30). However, like Hamscher, Clancey fails to teach or suggest “an editor that develops a report by referencing the software elements created from the one or more text documents to form a structure of the report,” as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 17, 29, 30, 42, and 54. Therefore, Clancey fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Saxton and Polizzi and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 8-10, 23, 36, 48, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 07643.0042

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 13, 2005

By: 
Ronald J. Ward
Reg. No. 54,870